

## REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 will remain pending in this application. Claims 11 and 30 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added in the above amendments.

### *Interview Summary*

Applicant's undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Isaac Tecklu participated in a telephonic interview on November 9, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Examiner Tecklu agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 ("Snyder") in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,089 ("Sinn"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant understands the rejection to be based in part on the premise, as stated in paragraph 7 of the September 10, 2007, office action, that "it is noted that the features upon which applicant argues against (i.e., manual invocation and registration are not excluded from the rejected claim(s). In other words, the plain language of the claims [does] not preclude and/or exclude as such manual invocation and registration manners. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims."

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 20, and 28 to more clearly recite that the embedding and registration processes are performed automatically and that the device database is deployed with the embedded stored procedure or procedures to the device as a single unit. Support for this added limitation can at least be found at paragraphs [0049] and [0065] of the Specification.

By contrast, as noted in the amendment filed June 20, 2007, the test executive system of Snyder clearly requires the individual and manual invocation and registration of tests with the test set database. In addition, Applicant notes that Sinn acknowledges that the method

disclosed at column 2, lines 12-31, and illustrated in Figure 3, “is cumbersome, however,” presumably because it “requires installation of additional code on the server side every time a new client function is required.” See column 2, lines 28-31. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sinn actually recommends against implementing the method disclosed at column 2, lines 12-31. Applicant further submits that this method does not involve automatically embedding each stored procedure in the data project into the device database, automatically registering each stored procedure in the data project with the device database, or deploying the device database with the at least one embedded stored procedure as a single unit to the device.

Based at least on the above reasoning, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Snyder nor Sinn, considered individually or in combination, teach or suggest at least the following features from independent claims 1 and 20, or the corresponding features from independent claims 9 and 28:

associating the data project with the device database;  
adding the at least one stored procedure to the data project;  
receiving a request to build the solution, and, responsive to the request:  
    automatically embedding each stored procedure in the data project into the device database;  
    automatically registering each stored procedure in the data project with the device database; and  
    deploying the device database with the at least one embedded stored procedure as a single unit to the device.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 20, and 28 are patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Applicant further submits that claims 2-8, 10, 12-19, 21-27, 29, and 31-38 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 303656.01 / MSFT-2787  
**Application No.:** 10/718,951  
**Office Action Dated:** September 10, 2007

**PATENT**  
**REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED**  
**PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO**  
**37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: December 10, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439